

Economic Impacts of the Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center

A Study of Projected Impact

April 2003



Prepared for:

The Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center
Port Washington, Wisconsin

Prepared by:

Paul Roback, Community Resource Development Educator
University of Wisconsin- Extension, Ozaukee County
121 West Main Street PO Box 994
Port Washington, Wisconsin 53074

and

Dave Marcouiller, Associate Professor and Extension Economist
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
University of Wisconsin - Madison/Extension
110 Old Music Hall, 925 Bascom Mall
Madison, WI 53703

Contents

Contents	2
Executive Summary	3
Introduction & Overview of the Maritime Heritage Center	4
Methods used to estimate the economic impact of the MHC	5
Results	8
Summary & Policy Implications of these Results	13
References	14
Appendix A	16

Executive Summary

The Community Resource Development Educator at UW-Extension, Ozaukee County, was approached by the City of Port Washington and the Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center to estimate the economic impact of a maritime heritage center in downtown Port Washington. In response, a study was undertaken to translate estimates of visitor expenditures resulting from the creation of a maritime heritage center into a regional economic impact for Ozaukee County using an input-output framework.

Average daily expenditures from a recent study of non-local Wisconsin State Parks visitors were applied to the projected annual attendance of the Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center. Three projected annual attendance figures of 10,000, 25,000 and 50,000 were used for this study. For the purpose of measuring impact on Ozaukee County, it was assumed that 50% of the visitors to the heritage center reside outside of Ozaukee County. The non-local visitor expenditure estimates range from a low of \$150,000 per year to a high of \$750,000 per year. Given the export-base framework of this study, this estimate does not include the expenditure impact of visitors who are from Ozaukee County. Thus, the economic impact estimates rely solely on “new” dollars flowing into the region from outside.

When applied to an input-output model for Ozaukee County, these “new” dollars translate into economic impact measured by income generated and jobs created. The creation of the Port Washington Maritime Heritage Museum is expected to stimulate the community’s retail and service sectors with multiplier effects felt in other local business. We estimate that the direct spending of non-local visitors should create additional economic activity with an estimated total economic impact on Ozaukee County’s total output ranging from a low of \$195,000 to a high of \$980,000 per year.

Limitations exist with this analysis and include assumptions regarding expenditure patterns, accuracy of projected attendance, ability of the current business structure to accommodate increased numbers of visitors, and general assumptions of input-output analysis. There is, however, ample reason to believe that positive economic impacts will be witnessed in the local economy as a result of a strategically planned and appropriately marketed Maritime Heritage Center. Weighing these positive impacts with traditional cost-benefit project analysis and inherent underlying political and social implications are necessary to fully address the impact of museum expansion.

Economic Impacts of the Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center A Study of Projected Impact

Introduction and overview of the Maritime Heritage Center

In 2000, the Maritime Heritage Center (MHC) was incorporated as a 501(c)3 non-profit organization to promote the enhancement and preservation of the maritime heritage of Wisconsin. The MHC will serve the community by establishing the infrastructure required to display maritime artifacts, conduct educational programming and community events, as well as fostering interest and appreciation of Southeastern Wisconsin's nautical history and culture.

Port Washington has a rich nautical history and it is an ideal setting for a maritime heritage center. For over a century, fishermen have used the port to make a living for their families and thousands of immigrants passed through the port to find a better life in the "New World." Many lost their lives near the shores of Port Washington. There are approximately ten shipwrecks within 20 miles of the shores of Port Washington.

On July 12, 2002, the MHC signed a lease for a 10,000 square foot space overlooking the Port Washington marina. The MHC is located in downtown Port Washington, which is on the National Register of Historic Places. This space is within walking distance of a historic light station and an operating lighthouse.

The MHC will be designed to display a comprehensive collection of Great Lakes artifacts. Programming will be developed for school groups and other organizations located throughout Wisconsin, which will provide educational opportunities for all ages. A small theater will welcome visitors and provide educational and historic information on Ozaukee County, the local history of shipwrecks and commercial fishing, as well as detailed descriptions of the artifacts housed at the MHC. Reception space will be provided for cultural activities, seminars, public meetings and social gatherings. A museum store will provide maritime related merchandise, books, apparel and souvenirs.

In November 2002, Dan McCotter, current president of the Maritime Heritage Center Board of Director's, and Randy Tetzlaff, Director of Planning and Development for the City of Port Washington, contacted the UW-Extension Community Resource Development Educator in Ozaukee County with the request to conduct an economic impact study of the proposed Maritime Heritage Center in Port Washington. This study is intended as a basis to better understand the local economy and to more fully explain the potential impacts of increasing tourism in Port Washington. As such, it can assist with the creation of

a base of contributors and members sufficient to help sustain the operating budget of the proposed facility.

The intent of this report is to describe the economic impacts associated with the proposed Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center's (MHC) on the local economy of Ozaukee County. Given completion of the MHC, visitors to the Center will contribute to the local economy through their consumption of locally available goods and services. Specifically, our interests focus on estimating the amount of NEW money brought into Ozaukee County by people from the outside and the impacts that this new money will have on generating business activity within Ozaukee County. The report is organized into four sections. Following this introduction, the second section outlines methods used to estimate the economic impact of the MHC. The third section describes results of the impact analysis. Finally, we conclude with a summary of the study and offer insights into possible implications of the results.

Methods used to estimate the economic impact of the MHC

To begin this section, we must admit to a general lack of primary data that is directly relevant to the spending habits of maritime museum visitors. Since the MHC is still largely in the proposed phase, this is particularly true for the Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center visitor. We base this analysis on our best judgment tempered by previous work in assessing Lake States tourism impacts.

Estimates of new dollars flowing into the region, Ozaukee County, were achieved following a three-step process. First, we used three separate benchmarks of annual attendance at the MHC thought to capture low, medium, and high estimates that can be achieved once the MHC begins operation and markets the site as a destination. It is important to point out that these visitation levels were identified using gross estimates from other studies of maritime museums (Tolson 2000). Specifically, we used 10,000, 25,000, and 50,000 annual visits as a basis for estimating total spending.

Second, we reduced the overall visitation levels to account for only the non-local visitor. This was done to focus on NEW dollars flowing into the community from the outside. For the purpose of measuring impact on Ozaukee County, it was assumed that 50 percent of the total visits to the MHC would be made by people from outside of Ozaukee County (non-locals). Since little tourism data was available for the City of Port Washington and no primary data exists that is

directly applicable to maritime museum visitors, this should be considered an ad-hoc estimate³.

Finally, the third step was to apply an expenditure pattern to the visitation level to estimate an annual amount of new spending that will act as a stimulus to drive economic impacts. Once again, we suffer from a general dearth of directly relevant data. In identifying an appropriate expenditure pattern data we were interested in tourism type, regional similarity, currency of research, and the ability to separate non-local from local spending habits. We looked at past research that addressed expenditure patterns of tourists done in Wisconsin during the past 10 years. These studies are arrayed in Appendix A. For our purposes, we decided to use a non-local visitor expenditure pattern derived in survey work from a recently completed study for the State of Wisconsin, Bureau of Parks and Recreation (Marcouiller, Olson and Prey 2002). This spending pattern is reflective of non-local Wisconsin State Park visitors during 1999 and 2000.

To reiterate, primary data on visitor expenditures specific to the Maritime Heritage Center does not exist. In order to develop relevant data, average daily expenditures for non-local Wisconsin State Park visitors were used as reasonable expenditure patterns that could be applied to this study. Average daily expenditures for non-local Wisconsin State Park visitors in 1999 are outlined in Table 1. Expenditures are identified by industry groups sensitive to travel expenditures. The first column in Table 1 is the average expenditures per person by category. The highest expenditure categories include lodging, automobiles/gas and restaurants/bars.

As shown in Table 1, non-local visitors to Wisconsin State Parks spend just shy of \$30 per day on travel related items. This is fairly consistent with the Port Washington Tourism Study that was conducted in the summer of 2000, which found the average per person expenditure per day to be \$31. When \$30 per day is expanded to the estimated non-local visitation levels, this translates into a low to high total inflow of new dollars of between roughly \$150,000 and \$750,000.

³ In the summer of 2000, a tourism study was conducted for the City of Port Washington. This study interviewed 610 visitors and found that the per-person average daily expenditure was \$31. Unfortunately, this study did not break these expenditures down by expenditure item, such as shopping, dining, lodging and entertainment, nor did it assess separate expenditure patterns based on visitor origin. Therefore, it was necessary to derive expenditure pattern data from other existing data sources.

Table 1. Non-local visitor expenditure estimates used in estimating impacts¹

Expenditure by item:	Visitor spending estimate ²	Estimated non-local visits used to calculate total new dollars		
		5,000	12,500	25,000
Shopping	\$1.72	\$8,578	\$21,445	\$42,890
Admission/Entertainment	\$0.61	\$3,060	\$7,649	\$15,298
Restaurants and Bars	\$5.09	\$25,461	\$63,651	\$127,303
Lodging	\$11.47	\$57,368	\$143,420	\$286,841
Automobile (gas/oil)	\$5.88	\$29,394	\$73,486	\$146,972
Groceries/Liquor	\$5.07	\$25,351	\$63,378	\$126,756
Total (2002 dollars)	\$29.84	\$149,212	\$373,030	\$746,059

1. Total annual spending estimates based on daily spending patterns adjusted for inflation to 2002 as reported in Appendix A and applied to non-local visitation levels based on 50 percent of total visits.
2. Based on non-local visitor spending as reported in Appendix A

Given the general lack of data specific to maritime museum visits, our intent here is less to identify a single value than to capture a reasonable range of non-local spending. As such, we feel confident that these estimates provide the relevant range upon which to estimate economic impacts⁴.

Visitor expenditures and economic impact are two separate issues. The Maritime Heritage Center will draw people into the Port Washington area. Expenditures by these people while they are in the Port Washington area contribute to the total receipts of firms, which operate in and around Port Washington. With increased receipts, these firms then react by creating jobs, meeting a payroll, paying local taxes and making their business more profitable. This leads to an economic impact, namely through the creation and distribution of jobs and income.

The primary focus in economic impact analysis is identifying how income is generated from new dollars flowing into the community from some stimulus. Economic impact describes the consequences of these new dollars by estimating the extent to which local businesses react to increased demand. These new dollars are used to maintain and expand business offerings of local businesses. Before getting into economic impact, visitor expenditure data and its expansion to the total number of museum visitors will be discussed.

⁴ There is bound to be error associated with the use of State Park visitor spending patterns as a proxy for maritime museum visits. This provides an important limitation to this analysis. To assuage fears of overestimating impacts, we offer the notion that use of these estimates is probably conservative given the tendency of State Park visitors to camp.

The economic impact assessment is conducted with the use of a regional economic model of Ozaukee County. The model, developed for this project using Micro-IMPLAN, is a standard input-output model of the county. At the heart of the Maritime Heritage Center impact model is a transaction table for Ozaukee County. This table tracks the flow of all goods and services produced by industries in the region. By identifying receipts to industry groupings from non-local Wisconsin State Park visitors, impacts of the MHC on the regional economy can be assessed. Details of input-output modeling can be obtained from a companion report published by the University of Wisconsin-Extension (see Deller, Sumathi, and Marcouiller 1993).

The analysis captures direct impacts, as identified in the expenditure section above, plus indirect and induced impacts. Some refer to direct and induced impacts as the “multiplier” impact. Local firms who are impacted through visitor spending, purchase goods and services to provide their product. These are often referred to as *intermediate purchased inputs*. Examples of these may include the purchase of furniture by a local motel, food purchases of a local restaurant, artwork and screening for articles of clothing, or wholesale purchases of t-shirts by a local merchant for resale. These purchases are important in transmitting dollars to other local firms and feed into what is termed the *indirect economic impact*.

Expenditures also filter into the economy through increased consumption by residents in Ozaukee County as a result of increases in household incomes. These increases occur due to the jobs created, both directly and indirectly, by the MHC. This is referred to as the *induced economic impact*.

Following construction of the Ozaukee County input-output model, three separate impact assessments were made. These included impact of the MHC at estimated visitation levels of 10,000, 25,000 and 50,000.

Expenditures from Table 1 were associated with specific economic sectors. For instance, expenditures on restaurants and bars were associated with eating and drinking establishments. All expenditures were constrained by the level, or supply, of existing business activity in Ozaukee. The results identified direct impacts from expenditures, as well as the multiplier effect caused by the linkages that exist between the industries and households in Ozaukee County. Results for the projected impact are found in the next section.

Results

Located just North of Milwaukee, Ozaukee County has many of the economic characteristics reflective of the modern suburb. The total personal income of its 32,000 households (population of roughly 82,000) was roughly \$3.7 billion in 2000. This translates into an average total household income of about \$114,500. Thus, the economic stimulus of new dollars spent by visitors to the MHC (\$150,000 to \$750,000 per year) is quite modest relative to the overall economic structure of the county.

When we apply the new dollars outlined in Table 1 to the input-output model of Ozaukee County, the multiplier effect of inter-industry purchases generates indirect impacts and the increased income of households drives induced impacts. These impacts are summarized for the alternative levels of non-local visitation in Tables 2 through 4 (Table 2 based on 5000 non-local visits, Table 3 based on 12,500 non-local visits, and Table 4 based on 25,000 non-local visits)

A quick note on the difference between output and value added. Output is the total fruit of the economic activity and is analogous to gross regional product, gross state product, and gross national product. In other words, it is the total accounting for all regional production. Value added is defined as the value of the region's business output minus the value of all inputs purchased from other firms. It is therefore a measure of the "profit" or income generated locally. Value added includes a combination of employee compensation, proprietor's income ("business profit"), other property type income, and taxes paid to governments.

Table 2. Impacts of a low estimate of visitation to the proposed Port Washington Maritime Museum³

Type of impact by 1 digit SIC	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts	Induced Impacts	Total Impacts
<i>Output (in 2000 dollars)</i>				
Agriculture	0	299	186	485
Mining	0	1	1	3
Construction	0	1,978	420	2,399
Manufacturing	0	3,035	1,698	4,733
Transport, communication, utilities	0	3,347	1,276	4,623
Trade	85,295	2,125	7,268	94,689
Finance, insurance, real estate	0	6,141	7,668	13,809
Services	56,196	8,836	8,835	73,867
Government	0	722	480	1,202
Other	0	0	43	43
Total	141,491	26,486	27,875	195,853
<i>Total value added (in 2000 dollars)</i>				
Agriculture	0	160	79	239
Mining	0	1	1	1
Construction	0	1,368	234	1,601
Manufacturing	0	1,250	702	1,952
Transport, communication, utilities	0	2,214	873	3,087
Trade	61,926	1,429	5,149	68,504
Finance, insurance, real estate	0	4,288	5,563	9,851
Services	32,288	5,420	5,564	43,272
Government	0	407	227	635
Other	0	0	43	43
Total	94,214	16,536	18,435	129,185
<i>Employment (in total jobs)</i>				
Agriculture	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Manufacturing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Transport, communication, utilities	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Trade	2.1	0.0	0.2	2.3
Finance, insurance, real estate	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Services	1.4	0.2	0.2	1.7
Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	3.5	0.3	0.4	4.2

3. 10,000 total visits with impacts based on the spending of non-local visitors (50 percent of total). Spending estimates as summarize in Table 1.

Table 3. Impacts of a medium estimate of visitation to the proposed Port Washington Maritime Museum⁴

Type of impact by 1 digit SIC	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts	Induced Impacts	Total Impacts
<i>Output (in 2000 dollars)</i>				
Agriculture	0	748	464	1,212
Mining	0	3	4	7
Construction	0	4,946	1,051	5,997
Manufacturing	0	7,588	4,244	11,832
Transport, communication, utilities	0	8,368	3,189	11,557
Trade	213,238	5,313	18,171	236,722
Finance, insurance, real estate	0	15,354	19,170	34,524
Services	140,491	22,089	22,087	184,667
Government	0	1,806	1,200	3,006
Other	0	0	108	108
Total	353,728	66,215	69,689	489,632
<i>Total value added (in 2000 dollars)</i>				
Agriculture	0	399	197	596
Mining	0	2	2	3
Construction	0	3,420	584	4,003
Manufacturing	0	3,124	1,755	4,879
Transport, communication, utilities	0	5,535	2,183	7,718
Trade	154,815	3,573	12,871	171,260
Finance, insurance, real estate	0	10,719	13,908	24,627
Services	80,719	13,550	13,910	108,179
Government	0	1,019	568	1,587
Other	0	0	108	108
Total	235,534	41,341	46,087	322,962
<i>Employment (in total jobs)</i>				
Agriculture	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Manufacturing	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Transport, communication, utilities	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Trade	5.3	0.1	0.4	5.8
Finance, insurance, real estate	0.0	0.1	0.1	0.2
Services	3.5	0.4	0.4	4.3
Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	8.8	0.8	1.0	10.6

4. 25,000 total visits with impacts based on the spending of non-local visitors (50 percent of total). Spending estimates as summarize in Table 1.

Table 4. Impacts of a high estimate of visitation to the proposed Port Washington Maritime Museum⁵

Type of impact by 1 digit SIC	Direct Impacts	Indirect Impacts	Induced Impacts	Total Impacts
<i>Output (in 2000 dollars)</i>				
Agriculture	0	1,497	928	2,425
Mining	0	7	7	14
Construction	0	9,892	2,102	11,995
Manufacturing	0	15,176	8,488	23,664
Transport, communication, utilities	0	16,736	6,378	23,115
Trade	426,475	10,626	36,342	473,443
Finance, insurance, real estate	0	30,707	38,340	69,047
Services	280,981	44,179	44,174	369,334
Government	0	3,612	2,400	6,012
Other (AGG)	0	0	216	216
Total	707,456	132,431	139,377	979,265
<i>Total value added (in 2000 dollars)</i>				
Agriculture	0	798	395	1,193
Mining	0	3	4	7
Construction	0	6,839	1,168	8,007
Manufacturing	0	6,248	3,511	9,759
Transport, communication, utilities	0	11,070	4,367	15,437
Trade	309,630	7,147	25,743	342,519
Finance, insurance, real estate	0	21,438	27,817	49,254
Services	161,438	27,101	27,820	216,359
Government	0	2,037	1,137	3,174
Other	0	0	216	216
Total	471,068	82,681	92,175	645,924
<i>Employment (in total jobs)</i>				
Agriculture	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Mining	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Construction	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
Manufacturing	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.1
Transport, communication, utilities	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.2
Trade	10.7	0.1	0.8	11.6
Finance, insurance, real estate	0.0	0.2	0.1	0.4
Services	7.0	0.8	0.8	8.6
Government	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1
Other	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
Total	17.6	1.6	1.9	21.2

5. 50,000 total visits with impacts based on the spending of non-local visitors (50 percent of total). Spending estimates as summarize in Table 1.

Summary and policy implications of these results

The intent of this report was to describe the economic impacts associated with the proposed Port Washington Maritime Heritage Center's (MHC) on the local economy of Ozaukee County. Specifically, our interests focused on estimating the amount of NEW money brought into Ozaukee County by people from the outside and the impacts that this new money will have on generating business activity within Ozaukee County. By applying expenditures to an input-output model for Ozaukee County, we estimated that the direct spending of non-local visitors will range from a low of \$125,000 per year to a high of \$750,000 per year. This direct spending should create additional economic activity with an estimated total economic impact on Ozaukee County to range from a low of \$195,000 to a high of \$980,000 per year.

As we have mentioned, we admit to a general lack of primary data that is directly relevant to the spending habits of maritime museum visitors. Therefore, when the MHC opens, effort should be made to solidify the numbers in this report. Measuring economic impact of the MHC should be an ongoing process. After a year of operations, the MHC should conduct an economic impact survey of visitors in order to measure the amount of money spent in the community by visitors from outside the county.

Since this report measures the impact of new money coming into Ozaukee County, effort should be made to continue to attract visitors from outside Ozaukee County. This is consistent with local efforts in the City of Port Washington. The Port Washington Tourism Council and local civic organizations host and promote festivals that draw thousands of visitors to the City from outside Ozaukee County. The MHC should build upon this success and work with these existing organizations.

Although this report details the positive impacts the MHC will have on the local economy, it does not address whether these positive impacts justify the expense of constructing and operating the MHC. Other factors, such as MHC revenue and endowment, may also be contributing factors in this decision making process.

This report focused on the economic impact of visitors from outside of Ozaukee County. The economic impacts associated with programming by the MHC that attracts residents from within Ozaukee County was not measured in this report. Visitors to the MHC that are residents of Ozaukee County impact the local economy daily. However, the MHC may also socially impact the residents of Ozaukee County, especially the residents in the City of Port Washington. Port

Washington has a long nautical history that its residents are proud of and the MHC may be able to capture and build upon this community pride.

Finally, this report does not detail the demographic characteristics of the visitors to the MHC. Many of the visitors to the MHC may include heritage tourists, who tend to (a) spend more money when visiting historic or cultural attractions and (b) stay for longer visits (see Webb 2001). A study of historical sites compiled by the Wisconsin Department of Tourism found that income levels for historic travelers tend to be above average and that the average per person per day expenditure of a historic visitor is \$42 (see Wisconsin Department of Tourism 2001). Marketing to heritage tourists may increase the regional impact of the MHC.

Limitations exist with this analysis and include assumptions regarding expenditure patterns, accuracy of projected attendance, ability of the current business structure to accommodate increased numbers of visitors, and general assumptions of input-output analysis. There is, however, ample reason to believe that positive economic impacts will be witnessed in the local economy as a result of a strategically planned and appropriately marketed Maritime Heritage Center. Weighing these positive impacts with traditional cost-benefit project analysis and inherent underlying political and social implications are necessary to fully address the impact of creating the Maritime Heritage Center.

References

Anderson, A., L. Hewitt, and D.W. Marcouiller. 2001. Outdoor recreation, community development, and change through time: A replicated study of canoeing and trout angling in Southwestern Wisconsin. Staff Paper 00-2, Center for Community Economic Development, UW - Madison/Extension, Madison, WI. 85 pages.

Deller, S.C., N.R. Sumathi, and D.W. Marcouiller. 1993. Regional Economic Models for the State of Wisconsin: An Application of the Micro-IMPLAN Modeling System. Staff Paper 93.6, Ctr. for Community Economic Development, Univ. of Wisconsin - Extension, Madison, WI. 38 pages.

Marcouiller, D., E. Olson, and J. Prey. 2002. State parks and their gateway communities: Development and recreation planning issues in Wisconsin. Monograph G3987, Board of Regents of the University of Wisconsin System, Madison, WI.

Marcouiller, D.W., S. Hamilton, and C. Jobe. 1995. Farm Progress Days 1994: Economic and educational impacts. Staff Paper 95.1, Tourism Research and Resource Center, University of Wisconsin - Extension, Madison, WI. 25 pages.

Norman, W.C., S. Hamilton, and D.W. Marcouiller. 1995. A profile of visitors to the EAA Air Adventure Museum. Staff Paper 95.4, Tourism Research and Resource Center, University of Wisconsin - Extension, Madison, WI. 24 pages.

Norman, B. and D. Marcouiller. 1994. Expenditure patterns of School of the Arts at Rhinelander participants. Staff Paper 94.14, Tourism Research and Resource Center, University of Wisconsin - Extension, Madison, WI. 8 pages.

Tolson, H. 2000. Survey of Maritime Heritage Attractions in the Great Lakes Region. East Lansing, MI: Center for Maritime and Underwater Resource Management, Michigan State University.

Van Koningsveld, R., W.C. Norman, and D.W. Marcouiller. 1994. Eagle watchers along the Wisconsin River: Survey results from the winter of 1993-1994. Staff Paper 94.3, Tourism Research and Resource Center, University of Wisconsin - Extension, Madison, WI. 22 pages.

Webb, Amy Jordan. 2001. Heritage Tourism Program.
<http://www.ruralheritage.org/heritagetourism/#benefits>

Wisconsin Department of Tourism. 2001. Wisconsin Historical Society Visitor Profile, 2001. Contact Sue Hamilton at the Wisconsin Department of Tourism to answer questions regarding this study.

Appendix A. Adjusted expenditures patterns in comparable 2002 dollars (reflective of general rates of product-based inflation)

Visitor study	EAA Air Adventure Museum ^a	Bird watchers in Sauk City/Prairie du Sac ^b	Wisconsin Farm Progress Days ^c	American Indian Gaming Facilities ^d	The UW Indianhead Arts Center ^e	Non-local Wisconsin State Parks Visitors ^f	Non-local Wisconsin State Trail Visitor ^f	Non-local Kickapoo River Anglers ^g	Non-local Kickapoo River Canoeists ^g
Region assessed	Winnebago Co.	Sauk-Prairie	Columbia Co.	Statewide		SE Wisc	SE Wisc	SW Wisc	SW Wisc
Year data collected	1993	1994	1995	1993	1988	1999	1999	1999	1999
Unit of assessment	Per Person	Per person	Per person	Per Person	Per Person	Per Person	Per Person	Per Person	Per Person
				Per Trip	Per Trip	Per Visit Day	Per Visit Day	Per Trip	Per Trip
Local/non-local difference	NO	NO	NO	NO	NO	YES	YES	YES	YES
Expenditure by item:									
Shopping	\$6.38	\$12.43				\$1.72	\$1.77	\$32.31	\$25.30
Admission/Entertainment	\$5.39					\$0.61	\$0.96	\$12.96	\$1.88
Restaurants and Bars	\$4.64	\$8.64	\$8.98	\$84.81	\$34.70	\$5.09	\$3.31	\$43.98	\$18.98
Lodging	\$4.31	\$4.50	\$1.25	\$39.14	\$38.97	\$11.47	\$2.24	\$49.84	\$22.56
Automobile (gas/oil)	\$1.84	\$3.34	\$1.17	\$39.14		\$5.88	\$1.75	\$24.46	\$9.75
Public Transport	\$0.63								
Groceries/Liquor	\$0.48					\$5.07	\$1.43	\$16.57	\$13.17
Automobile (repairs/parts)	\$0.03								
Miscellaneous	\$0.60		\$1.86	\$45.67	\$50.30			\$2.62	\$4.46
Total (2002 dollars)	\$24.29	\$28.91	\$13.26	\$208.76	\$123.97	\$29.84	\$11.46	\$182.74	\$96.09

a. as reported in "A profile of visitors to the 1993 EAA convention". Tourism Research and Resource Center, Staff Paper 95.4.

b. as reported in "Eagle watchers along the Wisconsin River: Survey results from the winter of 1993/1994." TRRC Report 95.4

c. as reported in "Farm Progress Days 1994: Economic and educational impacts." TRRC Report 95.2

d. as reported in ""The economic benefits of American Indian gaming facilities in Wisconsin" UW-Extension

e. as reported in "The UW Indianhead Arts Center: A case study of travel and spending behavior." UW-Extension

f. as reported in "State-owned recreational sites and their surrounding communities: An assessment of rural development impacts." UW-Madison URPL Staff Paper, August 2001

g. as reported in "Outdoor recreation, community development, and change through time: A replicated study of canoeing and trout angling in SW Wisconsin." CCED Staff Paper 00.02.

